arXiv:1408.2591v1 [math.DS] 12 Aug 2014

Non-Divergence of Unipotent Flows on Quotients of Rank One Semisimple Groups

C. Davis Buenger and Cheng Zheng

August 13, 2014

Abstract

Let G be a semisimple Lie group of rank 1 and Γ be a torsion free discrete subgroup of G. We show that in G/Γ, given $\epsilon > 0$, any trajectory of a unipotent flow remains in the set of points with injectivity radius larger than δ for $1-\epsilon$ proportion of the time for some $\delta > 0$. The result also holds for any finitely generated discrete subgroup Γ and this generalizes Dani's quantitative nondivergence theorem [Dan84] for lattices of rank one semisimple groups. Furthermore, for a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an injectivity radius δ such that for any unipotent trajectory $\{u_t x\}_{t\in[0,T]}$, either it spends at least $1-\epsilon$ proportion of the time in the set with injectivity radius larger than δ for all large $T > 0$ or there exists a $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$-normalized abelian subgroup L of G which intersects $g\Gamma g^{-1}$ in a small covolume lattice. We also extend these results when G is the product of rank-1 semisimple groups and Γ a discrete subgroup of G whose projection onto each nontrivial factor is torsion free.

1 Background and Statements

Let G be a Lie group, Γ be a discrete subgroup of G, and $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a one-parameter unipotent subgroup in G (that is, Ad_{u_t} is unipotent). In the case that $G = \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ and $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$, Margulis [M75] proved that each unipotent trajectory is non-divergent. Later, Dani [Dan79] improved Margulis's result by showing that for each unipotent trajectory on $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{Z})$ there exists a compact set K such that the relative time the trajectory spends in K is of positive proportion. In [Dan84], Dani further improved this result for any $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 Lie group and Γ an arbitrary lattice in G and showed that for any unipotent trajectory and any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $K(\epsilon)$ such that the relative proportion of time the trajectory spends in $K(\epsilon)$ is at least $1-\epsilon$. Finally in [Dan86], Dani generalized the theorem for any Lie group G and any lattice Γ in G.

In [Ra90, page 230] Ratner defined divergence for orbits on quotients of Lie groups by discrete groups as follows: given a Lie group G, a discrete group Γ, $h \in G$ and $x = g\Gamma \in G/\Gamma$, the h-orbit of x is said to be divergent if there exists a sequence $\{\gamma_n\} \in \Gamma \setminus \{e\}$ such that $(h^n g)\gamma_n(h^n g)^{-1} \to e$ as $n \to \infty$. Note that if Γ is a lattice, then $h^n x$ is divergent if and only if for every compact set K, we have $h^n x \notin K$ for all large n [Rag72, Chap.1]. In light of this definition, Ratner asked if the following holds:

Conjecture 1.1. *Given a unipotent one-parameter subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subseteq G$ and a discrete subgroup Γ of G, for any point $x = g\Gamma \in G/\Gamma$, there exists a neighborhood N of the identity in G such that*

$$\frac{1}{T} m(\{t \in [0,T] : N \cap (u_t g)\Gamma(u_t g)^{-1} \neq \{e\}\}) < \epsilon \text{ for all large } T > 0,$$

where m is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

We address this conjecture when G is a semisimple $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 group and more generally when G is the product of semisimple $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 groups. For a Lie group G and discrete group Γ, let X_δ denote the set of points in G/Γ with injectivity radius at least δ (see Section 2).

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose G is a semisimple Lie group of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 and Γ is a virtually torsion-free discrete subgroup of G. Let $X = G/\Gamma$. Then there exists a constant $c_\epsilon > 0$ such that for any one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of G, $\epsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$, $x \in X_\delta$, and $T > 0$*

$$\frac{1}{T} m(\{t \in [0,T] : u_t x \notin X_{c_\epsilon \delta}\}) \leqslant \epsilon. \tag{1}$$

Remark 1.1. Note that all finitely generated groups in $\mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbb{C})$ are virtually torsion free by a theorem of Selberg [Sel60].

We also address an analogue of the following uniform non-divergence result due to Dani:

Theorem 1.2 (Therorem 2.1, [Dan86])**.** *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any unipotent one-parameter subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ in $\mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ and any lattice $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with covolume 1, the following holds: either*

$$m(\{t \in [0,T] : u_t g\Lambda \cap B_\delta = \{0\}\}) > (1-\epsilon)T \text{ for all large } T > 0 \tag{2}$$

or there exists a $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$-invariant proper non-zero subspace W of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $W \cap \Lambda$ is a lattice in W.

Dani's result was later quatified by Kleinbock and Margulis [KM98] and Kleinbock [K10]. In light of their uniform results, we have the following dichotomy:

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a semisimple Lie group of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 and Γ be a virtually torsion-free discrete group in G. Given $\epsilon > 0$ there exist positive computable constants δ_ϵ and β_ϵ such that for any $\delta < \delta_\epsilon$, any one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of G, and any $x = g\Gamma \in G/\Gamma$ either*

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\{t \in [0,T] : u_t x \notin X_\delta\}\right) < \epsilon \text{ for all large } T > 0$$

or there exists a proper abelian subgroup L of G such that $\Delta := g\Gamma g^{-1} \cap L$ is a lattice in L, $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ normalizes L, and the covolume of $u_t\Delta u_{-t}$ in $u_t L u_{-t} = L$ is a fixed constant less than $(\beta_\epsilon\delta)^{\dim(L)}$ for all $t \geqslant 0$, where we define the measure on L/Δ as the measure induced by a fixed right invariant inner product on $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$.

Similar results hold in the case when G is the product of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 Lie groups:

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose $G = G_1 \times G_2 \times \cdots \times G_n$ where each G_i is semisimple and of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1. Let Γ be a discrete subgroup of G such that the projection of Γ onto each coordinate does not contain nontrivial elliptic elements. Then the conclusions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 hold.*

In fact, from our proof we can conclude the following

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose $G = \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Let Γ be any discrete subgroup of G. Then the conclusions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 hold.*

Remark 1.2. Our proof uses the existence of a Zassenhaus neighborhood, the Lie algebra structure, and the Bruhat decomposition for $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 semisimple Lie groups. We make direct use of the result of Kleinbock and Margulis on quantitative non-divergence on the space of unimodular lattices in $\mathbb{R}^n$, where n is the dimension of G. Unlike the proof of Dani's theorem, we do not make use of the structure theorem for the fundamental domain of lattices in $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 semisimple Lie groups.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Nimish Shah and Dimitry Kleinbock for their very helpful suggestions and comments during our discussions.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

Let G be a semisimple Lie group of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 and let $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. Let K be a maximal compact subgroup of G and let $\mathfrak{k}$ be it's Lie algebra. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$ and let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the orthogonal complement to $\mathfrak{k}$ with respect to the Killing form. We have the Cartan decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}.$$

Fix a one dimensional subspace $\mathfrak{a}$ of $\mathfrak{p}$. Consider the root space decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$ with respect to $\mathfrak{a}$. For a root $\beta \in \mathfrak{a}^*$, let $\mathfrak{u}^\beta$ denote the root space associated to β and let $\mathfrak{z}$ denote the space $\mathfrak{u}^0$. Since $\mathfrak{g}$ is of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1, there exists a real root α such that:

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u}^{-2\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^{\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^{2\alpha}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{n}^+ = \mathfrak{u}^\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{u}^{2\alpha}$ and $\mathfrak{n}^- = \mathfrak{u}^{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^{-2\alpha}$. We define $N^+ = \exp(\mathfrak{n}^+)$ and $N^- = \exp(\mathfrak{n}^-)$. Throughout we will abbreviate N^+ by N and $\mathfrak{n}^+$ by $\mathfrak{n}$. Let $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{z} \cap \mathfrak{k}$. Then

$$\mathfrak{z} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}.$$

Let $A = \exp(\mathfrak{a})$ and $M = Z_G(A) \cap K$. Then $\mathrm{Lie}(M) = \mathfrak{m}$. Let W be the Weyl group for G. As G is of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1, W is a group of order two. Let $\tilde{\omega} \neq e \in W$, and fix a representative $\omega \in G$ of $\tilde{\omega}$. We have the following Bruhat decomposition for semisimple groups of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 [Rag72, Section 12.14]

$$G = MAN \bigsqcup MAN\omega MAN. \tag{3}$$

Let Θ be the involution on $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to our Cartan decomposition and define positive definite inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ by

$$(x, y) = -\langle x, \Theta(y) \rangle.$$

Define

$$\|x\| := (x, x)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By definition, the norm $\|x\|$ is Ad_k invariant for all $k \in K$.

A Zaussenhaus neighborhood, Ω, for a Lie group F is defined as a neighborhood of $e \in F$ such that for any discrete group $\Delta \subseteq F$, there exists a connected nilpotent subgroup $H \subseteq F$ such that $\Delta \cap \Omega \subseteq H$. Note that any Lie group G admits a Zaussenhaus neighborhood [Rag72, Theorem 8.16].

Let $\mathfrak{b}_r$ denote the open ball of radius r centered at the origin in $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $0 < r_0 < \frac{1}{k}$, where k is the dimension of G, be such that the exponential map homeomorphically maps $\mathfrak{b}_{r_0}$ into G and $\exp(\mathfrak{b}_{r_0})$ is a Zaussenhaus neighborhood for G. For $\eta \leqslant r_0$, denote $\exp(\mathfrak{b}_\eta)$ as B_η.

Let Γ be a discrete subgroup of G and let $X = G/\Gamma$. As usual, G acts on X by left translations. For $x \in X$ let $G_x := \{g \in G : gx = x\}$. Then G_x is a conjugate of Γ. For any $0 < \eta \leqslant r_0$, define

$$X_\eta := \{x \in X : G_x \cap B_\eta = \{e\}\},$$

and for $\eta > r_0$ define $X_\eta = X$. Using the notation and definitions above, inequality (1) is equivalent to:

$$m\left(\{t \in [0, T] : G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}\}\right) \leqslant \epsilon T. \tag{4}$$

3 Uniform Virtual Linearization

In this section, we show that a unipotent trajectory lying in the complement of X_{r_0} can be associated to a unipotent trajectory in $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, where n is the dimension of G. This association allows us to apply the quantitative non-divergence results of Dani, Kleinbock, and Margulis to prove our result. Throughout this section, we assume that G is a semisimple Lie group of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1.

3.1 Algebraic properties of rank-1 semisimple Lie groups

Lemma 3.1. *Any nilpotent subgroup of G with no nontrivial elliptic elements is contained in a conjugate of either MA or MN.*

Proof. Let U be a nilpotent group with no nontrivial elliptic elements. Let x be a nontrivial element in the center of U. By assumption x is not elliptic.

By the multiplicative Jordan decomposition, there exist three commuting elements k, h and u in G such that $x = khu$ and k is elliptic, h is hyperbolic and u is unipotent. Moreover, k, h and u commute with every element commuting with x.

If $h \neq e$, then h is conjugate to an element in A. For simplicity, assume $h \in A$. All elements commuting with h are in MA, since G is $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1. By construction of h, all elements commuting with x also commute with h, so U is contained in MA.

If $h = e$, since x is not eliptic, $u \neq e$, and u has a conjugate in N. For simplicity, we assume $u \in N$. We shall show that all elements commuting with u are in MN. Suppose g commutes with u. By the Bruhat decomposition, $g \in MAN\omega MAN$ or $g \in MAN$.

If $g \in MAN\omega MAN$, then there exist $g_1, g_2 \in MAN$ such that $g = g_1\omega g_2$. We have $g_1\omega g_2 u = ug_1\omega g_2$ and $\omega g_2 u g_2^{-1}\omega^{-1} = g_1^{-1}ug_1$. Since MAN normalizes N and conjugation by ω sends N to N^-, we have $g_2 u g_2^{-1} = g_1^{-1}ug_1 \in N \cap N^- = \{e\}$. By assumption $u \neq e$, so this case cannot occur.

If $g \in MAN$, then there exist m, a, and n such that $g = man$. Since N is simply connected the exponential map from $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{u}^\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{u}^{2\alpha}$ to N is bijective. Thus there exists $u_\alpha \in \mathfrak{u}^\alpha$, $u_{2\alpha} \in \mathfrak{u}^{2\alpha}$ and $n_0 \in \mathfrak{n}$ such that $u = \exp(u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha})$ and $n = \exp(n_0)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} manun^{-1}a^{-1}m^{-1} &= u \\ \mathrm{Ad}(ma)\mathrm{Ad}(n)(u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha}) &= u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha} \\ \mathrm{Ad}(ma)[\exp(\mathrm{ad}(n_0))(u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha})] &= u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha} \\ \mathrm{Ad}(ma)(u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha} + \mathrm{ad}(n_0)(u_\alpha)) &= u_\alpha + u_{2\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

MA normalizes $\mathfrak{u}^\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{u}^{2\alpha}$ respectively, so

$$\mathrm{Ad}(ma)(u_\alpha) = u_\alpha \tag{5}$$

$$\mathrm{Ad}(ma)(u_{2\alpha} + \mathrm{ad}(n_0)(u_\alpha)) = u_{2\alpha}. \tag{6}$$

To show that $g \in MN$, we have to show $a = e$. Suppose that $a \neq e$. Then from equation (5) and the fact that our norm is Ad_m invariant, we get

$$\|u_\alpha\| = \|\mathrm{Ad}(m)\mathrm{Ad}(a)(u_\alpha)\| = \|\mathrm{Ad}(a)(u_\alpha)\| = |\alpha(a)|\|u_\alpha\|.$$

Since $a \neq e$, $|\alpha(a)| \neq 1$, so $u_\alpha = 0$. Then by the same argument with $u_\alpha = 0$, we get from equation (6) that $u_{2\alpha} = 0$. This forces u to be e. However, by assumption $u \neq e$. Therefore $g \in MN$.

Thus all elements commuting with u are in MN. In particular U is contained in MN. □

Remark 3.1. A maximal compact abelian subgroup of K may not be contained in M. Thus, the above lemma fails if we allow nilpotent subgroups with non-trivial elliptic elements. As an example, consider $SO(4,1)$. In this case, K is isomorphic to $SO(4)$ and M is isomorphic to $SO(3)$. $SO(4)$ contains a two dimensional torus, while any abelian subgroup of $SO(3)$ is either 0 or 1 dimensional.

Corollary 3.1. *For any torsion-free discrete subgroup Λ of G, $\Lambda \cap B_{r_0}$ is contained in a conjugate of either MA or MN, where B_{r_0} is a Zassenhaus neighborhood.*

Proof. B_{r_0} is a Zassenhaus neighborhood, so the group generated by $\Lambda \cap B_{r_0}$ is a torsion free discrete nilpotent subgroup, and the claim follows from Lemma 3.1. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let g be an element in G. We have*

(1) *$gMNg^{-1} \cap MA \subseteq M$.*

(2) *If $gMAg^{-1} \cap MA \nsubseteq M$, then $gMAg^{-1} = MA$ and $g \in MA \cup \omega MA$.*

(3) *If $gMNg^{-1} \cap MN$ contains a non-elliptic element, then $gMNg^{-1} = MN$ and in the case that g is unipotent, $g \in N$.*

Proof. We shall use the Bruhat decomposition for G. For each claim, we will first consider $g \in MAN$ and then consider $g \in MAN\omega MAN$.

(1) Let $g \in MAN$. Since MAN normalizes MN,

$$gMNg^{-1} \cap MA = MN \cap MA = M.$$

Now let $g \in MAN\omega MAN$. $g = g_1\omega g_2$ for some $g_1, g_2 \in MAN$. Suppose $y \in MA$ and $x \in MN$ are such that $gxg^{-1} = y$. Then $\omega^{-1}g_2xg_2^{-1}\omega = g_1^{-1}yg_1$. The left hand side belongs to MN^-, the right hand side belongs to MAN. Thus $g_1^{-1}yg_1 \in MN^{-1} \cap MAN = M$ and y must have trivial A component.

(2) Let $x \in MA$ and $y \in MA \setminus M$ be such that $gxg^{-1} = y$. Since the only elliptic elements in MA are in M, we may assume that $x \in MA \setminus M$ as well.

Let $g \in MAN$ Then $g = man$ for some $m \in M$, $a \in A$ and $n \in N$. We have $manxn^{-1}a^{-1}m^{-1} = y$. Then $nxn^{-1} \in MA$ and hence $x^{-1}nxn^{-1} \in MA$. However, $(x^{-1}nx)n^{-1} \in N$ since MA normalizes N. So $x^{-1}nxn^{-1} = e$ i.e. x and n commute. This forces n to be identity as $x \in MA \setminus M$. Thus $g \in MA$ and $gMAg^{-1} = MA$.

Now let $g \in MAN\omega MAN$. Then $g = g_1\omega g_2$ for some $g_1, g_2 \in MAN$. We have

$$g_1\omega g_2xg_2^{-1}\omega^{-1}g_1^{-1} = y.$$

Let $\beta_1 = g_1^{-1}yg_1 \in MAN$ and $\beta_2 = g_2xg_2^{-1} \in MAN$. Then $\omega\beta_2\omega^{-1} = \beta_1$. Conjugation by the Weyl group element ω sends N to N^-. Therefore, both β_1 and β_2 are elements in MA. Now $\beta_1 = g_1^{-1}yg_1$ with $y \in MA \setminus M$ and $\beta_1 \in MA$. By repeating the argument from the case when $g \in MAN$, it follows that $g_1 \in MA$. In the same way, $g_2 \in MA$. Since conjugation by ω sends MA to itself, $gMAg^{-1} = MA$.

(3) Let $g \in MAN$. Since MAN normalizes MN, $gMNg^{-1} = MN$. If g is unipotent, then $g \in N$.

Now let $g \in MAN\omega MAN$. Then $g = g_1\omega g_2$ for some $g_1, g_2 \in MAN$. We can find non-elliptic elements $x, y \in MN$ such that $g_1\omega g_2xg_2^{-1}\omega^{-1}g_1^{-1} = y$, i.e. $\omega g_2xg_2^{-1}\omega^{-1} = g_1^{-1}yg_1$. Since g_1, g_2 normalize MN and ω sends N to N^{-1}, $g_1^{-1}yg_1$ has to be an element in M. This contradicts the assumption that y is non-elliptic. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let H_1 and H_2 be subgroups of G such that each is conjugate to either MA or MN. If there exists a non-elliptic element γ in $H_1 \cap H_2$, then $H_1 = H_2$.*

Proof. By (1) H_1 and H_2 must either both be conjugate to MA or both be conjugate to MN. If they are both conjugate to MA, then (2) implies $H_1 = H_2$. If they are both conjugate to MN, then (3) implies $H_1 = H_2$. □

The following observation is crucial to our proof.

Lemma 3.3. *Let F be a Lie group with Lie subgroups H and K such that K is compact, K normalizes H, and $F \cong K \ltimes H$. Suppose there exists an automorphism θ of F contracting H and fixing every element of K, where by contracting, we mean that $\theta^k(h) \to e$ as $k \to \infty$ for all $h \in H$. Then there exists a constant l_K depending only on K such that for all discrete subgroups $\Lambda \subseteq F$, there exists a finite index subgroup Λ_0 of Λ such that $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0] \leqslant l_K$ and Λ_0 is contained in a connected nilpotent subgroup of F.*

Proof. Let Λ be a discrete subgroup of F. For any $x \in F$, we write $k(x)$ for its K component and $h(x)$ for its H component; in other words, $x = (k(x), h(x)) \in KH$.

Fix a neighborhood U of e in K and a neighborhood V of e in H such that $U \times V$ is a Zassenhaus neighborhood for F. Let $S = \{\lambda \in \Lambda | k(\lambda) \in U\}$ and define Λ_0 as the subgroup of Λ generated by S. We show that Λ_0 satisfies the required properties.

We first prove that Λ_0 is contained in a connected nilpotent subgroup of F. Let $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be an indexing of the elements of S and fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since θ contracts N, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta^m(h_i) \in V$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\lambda_i' = \theta^m(k_i h_i) = k_i \theta^m(h_i)$ is in the Zassenhaus neighborhood $U \times V$, and as θ is a contracting automorphism the group generated by $\{\lambda_i'\}_{i=1}^n$ is still discrete. Thus there exists a connected nilpotent subgroup H_n' containing $\{\lambda_i'\}_{i=1}^n$. After applying negative powers of θ, $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is contained in a connected nilpotent subgroup $H_n = \theta^{-m}(H_n')$. We denote its corresponding nilpotent subalgebra by $\mathfrak{h}_n$.

By the construction above, this sequence $\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{h}_2, \ldots$ is increasing (i.e. $\mathfrak{h}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{h}_2 \subseteq ...$). Let $\mathfrak{h} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{h}_k$ and F be the corresponding connected subgroup in KH. Then F is a connected nilpotent subgroup and contains Λ_0.

Now we show that the index $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0]$ is bounded by a number depending only on K. Fix a neighborhood of e say $U' \subset U$ such that $U'U'^{-1} \subseteq U$. Let $l_K = \lceil \frac{\mathrm{Vol}K}{\mathrm{Vol}U'} \rceil$. If λ_1,λ_2, ...,λ_m are different representatives for Λ/Λ_0, then from the definition of Λ_0, we know that $k(\lambda_i)^{-1}k(\lambda_j) \notin U$ for $i \neq j$. This implies that $k(\lambda_i)U'$ are pairwise disjoint in K. Since K is compact, this forces m to be less than l_K. Hence, the index $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0]$ is bounded by a number depending only on K.

□

Corollary 3.3. *Any discrete subgroup Λ in MN (respectively MA) has a subgroup Λ_0 of finite index such that Λ_0 is contained in a connected nilpotent subgroup of MN (respectively MA). Moreover, the index $[\Lambda, \Lambda_0]$ is bounded by a number depending only on M.*

Proof. Since M is compact and normalizes both A and N, by the lemma it will suffice to find automorphisms of MN and MA, which act trivially on M and contract N and A respectfully. In the case of MN there exists an element $a \in A$ such that conjugation by a is a contracting automorphism of N and a commutes with M. In the case of MA, let $\theta_c : MA \to MA$ be the map sending $(m, \exp(tx))$ to $(m, \exp(ctx))$ for $c > 0$, where x is a nonzero element in $\mathfrak{a}$. For $c < 1$, θ_c is an automorphism of MA contracting A.

□

Before proving the next lemma, we recall the definition of k-step nilpotent group. Let H be a nilpotent group with $H^{(0)} = H$ and $H^{(i+1)} = [H, H^{(i)}]$. If k is a number such that $H^{(k)} = \{e\}$, then H is called k-step nilpotent.

Lemma 3.4. *Any connected nilpotent subgroup H of MN or MA is 2-step nilpotent. Furthermore, $[H,H] \subseteq [N,N]$.*

Proof. Let $H \subseteq MA$. Since H is connected and nilpotent, the projection of H onto M is compact and nilpotent. However, any compact nilpotent Lie group is abelian. So H is abelian, and any abelian group is 2-step and $[H,H] = \{e\}$.

Now let $H \subseteq MN$. As G has finite center, by adjoint representation of G, it is harmless to assume that H, M and N are linear groups in $GL(n,\mathbb{C})$. The projection of H onto M is compact nilpotent, hence abelian. So we can assume that M is compact abelian. Let $\bar{H}$, $\bar{M}$ and $\bar{N}$ be the Zariski closures of H, M and N respectively. Since $\bar{M} \ltimes \bar{N}$ is algebraic, $\bar{H} \subseteq \bar{M} \ltimes \bar{N}$. Being a nilpotent algebraic group, $\bar{H}$ is the product $S \times U$ where S is the maximal torus in $\bar{H}$ and U is the unipotent radical. Moreover, $[\bar{H},\bar{H}] \subseteq [U,U]$. By Jordan decomposition, this implies that $U \subseteq \bar{N}$ and $[\bar{H},\bar{H}] \subseteq [\bar{N},\bar{N}]$. Since N is 2-step nilpotent, so is U. Therefore, $\bar{H}$ and H are 2-step nilpotent and $[H,H] \subseteq [N,N]$.

□

Another crucial ingredient in our proof is the following observation.

Lemma 3.5. *Let Λ be a discrete subgroup of a 2-step connceted nilpotent group H. Let* exp *denote the exponential map from* Lie(H) *to H. Then $\mathbb{Z}$-span$\{\exp^{-1}\Lambda\} \subseteq \frac{1}{2}\exp^{-1}\Lambda$, where $\exp^{-1}$ denotes the pre-image under the exponential map. Moreover, if $\Delta = \mathbb{Z}$-span$\{\exp^{-1}\Lambda\}$, then $[\Delta,\Delta]$(= the set of $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combinations of $[x,y]$ where $x,y \in \Delta$) is contained in $\exp^{-1}[\Lambda,\Lambda]$.*

Proof. Since H is 2-step nilpotent, by Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula,

$$\exp X \cdot \exp Y = \exp(X + Y + \frac{1}{2}[X,Y])$$

for X, Y in the Lie algebra of H. Also we have

$$\exp[X,Y] = [\exp X, \exp Y]$$

and elements of this kind are in the center of H. Now for $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n \in \exp^{-1}\Lambda$, we have

$$\exp X_1 \cdot \exp X_2 \cdot ... \cdot \exp X_n = \exp(\sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j}[X_i, X_j])$$

$$(\exp X_1 \cdot \exp X_2 \cdot ... \cdot \exp X_n)^2 = \exp(2\sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i + \sum_{i<j}[X_i, X_j])$$

$$(\exp X_1 \cdot \exp X_2 \cdot ... \cdot \exp X_n)^2 \cdot \exp(-\sum_{i<j}[X_i, X_j]) = \exp(2\sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i).$$

Therefore $\exp(2\sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i) \in \Lambda$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i \in \frac{1}{2}\exp^{-1}\Lambda$. This finishes the first part of the lemma.

Now suppose $X, Y \in \exp^{-1}(\Lambda)$. By the equation $\exp[X,Y] = [\exp X, \exp Y]$, $[X,Y] \in \exp^{-1}([\Lambda,\Lambda])$. Since Λ is a discrete subgroup of the 2-step nilpotent group H, $\exp^{-1}[\Lambda,\Lambda]$ is an abelian discrete subgroup in the vector space Lie(H). Therefore, if $\Delta = \mathbb{Z}$-span$\{\exp^{-1}\Lambda\}$, then

$$[\Delta,\Delta] \subseteq [\exp^{-1}\Lambda, \exp^{-1}\Lambda] \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{\exp^{-1}[\Lambda,\Lambda]\} = \exp^{-1}[\Lambda,\Lambda].$$

□

3.2 (r, u_t, x)-dominant subgroups

For the remainder of this section, let Γ be a discrete group of G, $T > 0$, $0 < \delta \leqslant r_0$, $x \in X_\delta$, and $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a one-parameter unipotent subgroup of G. In the following, an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ means a connected subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 3.1. *Let I be an interval in $\mathbb{R}$ and let $r > 0$. We say that a subgroup H of G is an (r, u_t, x)-dominant group on the interval I if $G_{u_t x} \cap B_r \subseteq u_t H u_{-t}$ for all $t \in I$.*

Consider the intersection $G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta$ for $t \in [0, T]$, and we can split up $[0, T]$ into subintervals such that

1. $[0, T] = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup ... \sqcup I_k$ (disjoint union)
2. $G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta = \{e\}$ on $I_1, I_3, ...$ (that is, for all t in $I_1, I_3, ...$) which are closed in $[0, T]$
3. $G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}$ on $I_2, I_4, ...$ which are open in $[0, T]$

The following Lemma guarantees that our partition is finite.

Lemma 3.6. *Let G be an arbitrary Lie group, let $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm on $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$, and let r_0 be such that the natural log is defined on B_{r_0}. Let Γ be a discrete subgroup of G, let $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a one-parameter unipotent subgroup of G, and $x \in G/\Gamma$. Then for any $T > 0$ and $0 < \delta < r_0$ the number of connected components of $\{t \in [0, T] : G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}\}$ is finite.*

Proof. Assume that $\{t \in [0, T] : G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}\}$ has infinitely many connected components. By the compactness of $[0, T]$ there exists a point $t \in [0, T]$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$ $(t-\epsilon, t+\epsilon)$ intersects infinitely many elements of the partition. Hence we may find points $s_1, s_2, \ldots$ such that each s_i is in a distinct connected component and $s_i \to t$. There exists $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$ such that $u_{s_i}\gamma_i u_{-s_i} \in B_\delta$. By discreteness of Γ, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\gamma_i = \gamma_1$ and let $x = log(u_t\gamma_1 u_{-t}) \in \overline{\mathfrak{b}_\delta}$. But $Ad_{u_{s-t}}x$ can not enter and leave $\overline{\mathfrak{b}_\delta}$ infinitely often since the map $s \mapsto Ad_{u_{s-t}}x$ is a polynomial map. This contradicts the infinitely many components.

□

Lemma 3.7. *For each interval I_j on which $G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}$, there exists a Lie subgroup H of G which is a (δ, u_t, x)-dominant group on I_j and H is conjugate to a subgroup of MA or MN.*

Proof. Choose $t_0 \in I_j$. By Lemma 3.1 we can find a subgroup $F_0 \subseteq G$ such that $G_{u_{t_0}x} \cap B_\delta \subseteq F_0$, and F_0 is conjugate to MA or MN. As Γ is torsion free and $G_{u_{t_0}x}$ is conjugate to Γ, F_0 is not contained in a conjugate of M and our choice for F_0 is unique by Lemma 3.2. Let $F = u_{-t_0}F_0u_{t_0}$.

Let

$$a = \inf\left\{t \in I_j : G_{u_s x} \cap B_\delta \subseteq u_s F u_s^{-1}, s \in [t, t_0]\right\}.$$

We shall show that $I_j \subseteq [a, \infty)$. If not, then $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and there exists a subgroup H conjugate to either MA or MN such that $G_{u_a x} \cap B_\delta \subseteq H$. We can choose a small number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $u_\epsilon H u_\epsilon^{-1} \cap G_{u_{a+\epsilon}} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}$. Then $u_{a+\epsilon}Fu_{a+\epsilon}^{-1}$ and $u_\epsilon H u_\epsilon^{-1}$ have nontrivial intersection. Since Γ was torsion free, the intersection must fall outside of any conjugate of M and hence by Lemma 3.2, $u_\epsilon H u_\epsilon^{-1} = u_{a+\epsilon}Fu_{a+\epsilon}^{-1}$, and $H = u_a F u_a^{-1}$. We can choose a small number $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $c \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$, $u_c H u_c^{-1} \cap G_{u_{a+c}x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}$. Again, since Γ was torsion free, the intersection must fall outside of any conjugate of M and by Lemma 3.2, $G_{u_{a+c}} \cap B_\delta \subseteq u_c H u_c^{-1} = u_{a+c}Fu_{a+c}^{-1}$. This contradicts the choice of a.

To finish the proof, repeat the above argument with

$$b = \sup\left\{t \in I_j = (a_j, b_j) | G_{u_s x} \cap B_\delta \subseteq u_s F u_s^{-1}, s \in [t_0, t]\right\}$$

to get $I_j \subseteq (-\infty, b]$. □

4 Non-Divergence: $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1

We shall use the non-divergence results of Margulis [M75], Dani [Dan84] [Dan86], Kleinbock and Margulis [KM98], and Kleinbock [K10] for actions of one-parameter unipotent subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(k,\mathbb{R})$ on unimodular lattices in $\mathbb{R}^k$.

4.1 Primitive subgroups of discrete subgroups of $\mathbb{R}^k$

For a discrete subgroup Λ, let $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ denote the set of all primitive subgroups contained in Λ. In other words,

$$\mathcal{L}(\Lambda) := \{\Delta \subseteq \Lambda : \ \mathbb{R}\text{-span}(\Delta) \cap \Lambda = \Delta\}.$$

For a discrete subgroup $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, let $\|\Delta\|_0$ denote the covolume of Δ in its $\mathbb{R}$-span.

Fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^k$. For $0 < m \leqslant k$, choose a Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_{m,k}$ on $\wedge^m\mathbb{R}^k$ such that the set

$$\{e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_m} : i_1 < \cdots < i_m\}$$

is an orthonormal basis of $\wedge^m\mathbb{R}^k$. For any discrete subgroup Λ in $\mathbb{R}^k$ of rank m, we have

$$\|\Lambda\|_0 = \|\gamma_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \gamma_m\|_{m,k}$$

where $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\}$ is a basis for Λ. Since the set $\{\gamma_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \gamma_m : \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_m \in \Lambda\}$ is discrete in $\wedge^m\mathbb{R}^k$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Λ be a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^k$. For any $C > 0$,*

$$\#\{\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda) : \|\Delta\|_0 < C\} < \infty.$$

4.2 Quantitative non-divergence in the space of unimodular lattices

For positive numbers C and α and a subset B of $\mathbb{R}$, we say that a function $f : B \to \mathbb{R}$ is (C,α)-good on B if for any open interval $J \subseteq B$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, f satisfies the relation

$$m(\{t \in J : |f(x)| < \epsilon\}) \leqslant C\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\sup_{t\in J}|f(t)|}\right)^{\alpha} m(J).$$

The following two propositions identify some functions which are (C,α)-good. For a more detailed explanation of which functions are (C,α)-good, see [K10] and [KM98].

Proposition 4.1 ([K10, Proposition 3.2] [DM93, Lemma 4.1])**.** *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, any polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree not greater than k is $\left(k(k+1)^{\frac{1}{k}}, \frac{1}{k}\right)$-good on $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proposition 4.2. *Let f be a function on $\mathbb{R}$. If f is (C,α)-good on $\mathbb{R}$, then $\sqrt{f}$ is $(C,2\alpha)$-good on $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. The obvious calculation yields the result. □

Proposition 4.3 (cf. [K10, Corollary 3.3])**.** *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, any one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of $\mathrm{SL}(k,\mathbb{R})$, any lattice Λ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, and any subgroup Δ of Λ, the function $t \mapsto \|u_t\Delta\|_0$ is $(k^2(k^2+1)^{\frac{1}{k^2}}, \frac{1}{k^2})$-good.*

Proof. Suppose the rank of Δ is m. Let $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\}$ be a generating set for Δ. Then for all $t \geqslant 0$,

$$\|u_t\Delta\|_0 = \|(\wedge^m u_t)(\gamma_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \gamma_m)\|_{m,k},$$

where $(\wedge^m u_t)$ acts by u_t on each coordinate of $\gamma_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \gamma_m$. The action of $(\wedge^m u_t)$ on each basis vector $e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_m}$ with $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ of $\wedge^m\mathbb{R}^k$, is a polynomial of degree at most $\frac{k(k-1)}{2}$. Hence $\|u_t\Delta\|_0^2 = \|(\wedge^m u_t)(\gamma_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \gamma_m)\|_{m,k}^2$ is a polynomial of degree at most $\frac{k(k-1)}{2}$. The claim then follows from Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. □

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and Δ be as in Proposition 4.3. Suppose there exists $r > 0$ such that $\|u_t\Delta\|_0 < r$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. Then $\|u_t\Delta\|_0 = \|\Delta\|_0 < r$.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that the map $t \mapsto \|u_t\Delta\|_0^2$ is a polynomial map. □

For a discrete subgroup Λ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, define

$$d_1(\Lambda) = \inf_{v\in\Lambda\setminus\{0\}} \|v\|.$$

We have the following elementary result for discrete groups in $\mathbb{R}^k$ (see [K10] page 8 for a sharper result).

Lemma 4.2. *Let Δ be a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$d_1(\Delta) \leqslant 4(\|\Delta\|_0)^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta)}}.$$

The following constitutes our main tool.

Theorem 4.1 ([K10, Theorem 3.4])**.** *Suppose an interval $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $C, \alpha > 0$, $0 < \rho < 1$, and a continuous map $h : B \to \mathrm{SL}(k,\mathbb{R})$ are given. Assume that for any $\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{Z}^k)$,*

1. *The function $t \mapsto \|h(t)\Delta\|_0$ is (C,α)-good on B, and*
2. *$\sup_{t\in B} \|h(t)\Delta\|_0 \geqslant \rho^{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta)}$.*

Then for any $0 < \epsilon < \rho$,

$$m\left(\{t \in B : d_1(h(t)\mathbb{Z}^k) < \epsilon\}\right) \leqslant k2^k C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^{\alpha} m(B). \tag{7}$$

We combine the above results in the following.

Corollary 4.1 ([KM98], [K10])**.** *Let Λ be a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^k$, B be an interval in $\mathbb{R}$, and let*

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho = \rho(\Lambda, B) &:= \min\left(1/k, \inf_{\Delta\in\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)} \left\{\sup_{t\in B} \|h_t\Delta\|_0^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta)}}\right\}\right) \\
&\geqslant \min\left(1/k, \frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in B} d_1(h_t\Lambda)\right), \\
C_k &:= k^3 2^k (k^2+1)^{1/k^2}, \\
\alpha_k &:= 1/k^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then for any one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{h_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of $\mathrm{SL}(k,\mathbb{R})$ and any $0 < \epsilon < \rho$, one has

$$m\left(\{t \in B : d_1(h_t\Lambda) < \epsilon\}\right) \leqslant C_k \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^{\alpha_k} m(B).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.9 of [K10], one may replace $\mathbb{Z}^k$ in Theorem 4.1 with any discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^k$. By Proposition 4.3, for every $\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ the function $\|h(t)\Delta\|_0$ is $(k^2(k^2+1)^{\frac{1}{k^2}}, \frac{1}{k^2})$-good on $[0,T]$. Thus the first condition of Theorem 4.1 is satisfied, and by our choice of ρ the second is also satisfied.

Note that by Lemma 4.2,

$$\inf_{\Delta\in\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)} \left\{\sup_{t\in B} \|h_t\Delta\|_0^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta)}}\right\} \geqslant \inf_{\Delta\in\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)} \left\{\frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in B} d_1(h_t\Delta)\right\} \geqslant \frac{1}{4}\sup_{t\in B} d_1(h_t\Lambda).$$

This gives the inequality in the condition of ρ. □

4.3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Proof. Let Γ be a virtually torsion free discrete subgroup of G. By obvious adjustments to c_ϵ, without loss of generality, we may assume that Γ is torsion free. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta \leqslant r_0$. Fix a one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of G, $x \in X_\delta$, and $T > 0$. Then there exist finitely many disjoint intervals $I_1, I_2, I_3 \dots$ such that

1. $[0,T] = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup \dots$
2. $G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta = \{e\}$ on $I_1, I_3, \dots$ which are closed in $[0,T]$
3. $G_{u_t x} \cap B_\delta \neq \{e\}$ on $I_2, I_4, \dots$ which are open in $[0,T]$.

By the fact that the intervals are disjoint and in view of (4), it is enough to show that there exists $c_\epsilon > 0$ independent of x, $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, and T such that for each $j \in 2\mathbb{Z}$,

$$m\left(\{t \in I_j : G_{u_t x} \cap B_{c_\epsilon \delta} \neq \{e\}\}\right) \leqslant \epsilon \cdot m(I_j). \tag{8}$$

Let j be even and $I_j = (a_j, b_j)$. By Lemma 3.7 there exists an (δ, u_t, x)-dominant subgroup H_j on I_j such that H_j is conjugate to a subgroup of MN or MA.

Let $F_j = G_x \cap H$. By Corollary 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, there exists a subgroup $\tilde{F}_j$ of F_j and a constant l_M depending only on M such that $[F_j : \tilde{F}_j] \leqslant l_M$ and $\tilde{F}_j$ is contained in a connected 2-step nilpotent subgroup $\tilde{H}_j$ of H_j.

By Lemma 3.5, $\Lambda_j := \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{\exp^{-1}(\tilde{F})\}$ is a discrete subgroup in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H}_j) \subseteq \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. We apply the Corollary 4.1 to Λ_j in the case of $B = I_j$ and $h_t = \mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}$. Since u_t is a one-parameter unipotent subgroup, $h_t = \mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}$ is a one-parameter unipotent subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(k,\mathbb{R})$, where k is the dimension of $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$. By Corollary 4.1, for any $0 < \eta \leqslant \rho_j = \rho(\Lambda_j, I_j)$,

$$m\left(\{x \in I_j : d_1(h_x\Lambda_j) < \eta\}\right) \leqslant C_k \left(\frac{\eta}{\rho_j}\right)^{\alpha_k} m(I_j). \tag{9}$$

Further assume that $0 < \eta \leqslant \min\{r_0, \rho_j\}$. For every $f \in \tilde{F}_j$ and $t \in I_j$, $\|u_t f u_{-t}\| \leqslant \eta$ implies that $d_1(h_t\Lambda_j) < \eta$. Thus

$$m\left(\left\{t \in I_j : u_t \tilde{F}_j u_{-t} \cap B_\eta \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) \leqslant m\left(\{t \in I_j : d_1(h_t\Lambda_j) < \eta\}\right).$$

For any $g \in F_j$, $g^{l_M} \in \tilde{F}_j$. Hence if $\|g\| < \eta/l_M$, then $\|g^{l_M}\| < \eta$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} m(\{t \in I_j : G_{u_t x} \cap B_{\eta/l_M} \neq \{e\}\}) &\leqslant m\left(\left\{t \in I_j : u_t \tilde{F} u_{-t} \cap B_\eta \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) \\ &\leqslant m\left(\{t \in I_j : d_1(h_x\Lambda) < \eta\}\right) \\ &\leqslant C_k \left(\frac{\eta}{\rho_j}\right)^{\alpha_k} m(I_j). \end{aligned}$$

By construction of F_j, we have $u_{a_j} F_j u_{-a_j} \cap B_\delta = \{e\}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.5, $\mathrm{Ad}_{u_{a_j}}(\Lambda_j) \cap \mathfrak{b}_{\frac{\delta}{2}} = \{0\}$. Let $\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda_j)$. Then by Lemma 4.2,

$$\sup_{t\in B} \|h_t\Delta\|_0^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta)}} \geqslant \|h_{a_j}\Delta\|_0^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta)}} \geqslant \frac{d_1(\Delta)}{2} \geqslant \frac{\delta}{8}.$$

Recall that we chose $r_0 < \frac{1}{k}$, so $\rho \geqslant \frac{\delta}{8}$. Choose η such that $C_k\left(\frac{8\eta}{\delta}\right)^{\alpha_k} = \epsilon$ and let $\delta = \eta/l_M$. By above, (8) holds for every interval I_j with

$$c_\epsilon = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{C_k}\right)^{k^2} \frac{1}{8l_M}. \tag{A}$$

□

4.4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Fix $r_0 > 0$ such that B_{r_0} is a Zassenhaus neighborhood and $\eta \in (0,1]$. By the proof of Theorem 1.1, for $\delta = c_{\epsilon/2}\eta r_0$, if $y \in X_{\eta r_0}$, then for any unipotent one parameter subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of G,

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\{t \in [0,T] : u_t y \notin X_\delta\}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon, \text{ for all } T > 0.$$

Therefore, if $x \in X$ and $t_0 \geqslant 0$ are such that $u_{t_0} x \in X_{\eta r_0}$, then for $T > t_0(2\epsilon^{-1} - 1)$

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\{t \in [0,T] : u_t x \notin X_\delta\}\right) < \epsilon.$$

We will prove the theorem with

$$\delta_\epsilon = c_{\epsilon/2} r_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \eta\delta_\epsilon, \tag{B}$$

where c_ϵ is as in Theorem 1.1. By above we may assume that $x = g\Gamma \in X$ is such that $u_t x \notin X_{\eta r_0}$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. By Lemma 3.7, there exists an $(\eta r_0, u_t, x)$-dominant subgroup H on $[0,\infty)$ such that H is conjugate to MA or MN. Let $F = g\Gamma g^{-1} \cap H \neq \{e\}$ which is torsion-free. By Corollary 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, there exists a subgroup $\tilde{F}$ of F and a constant l_M depending only on M such that $[F : \tilde{F}] \leqslant l_M$ and $\tilde{F}$ is contained in a connected 2-step nilpotent subgroup $\tilde{H}$ of H.

Define $\Lambda_0 := \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{\exp^{-1}(\tilde{F})\}$. Again, by Lemma 3.5, Λ_0 is a discrete subgroup in $\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H})$. We proceed now as in the proof of Dani's uniform non-divergence result [Dan86, Theorem 2.1]. Suppose there exists $T_0 \geqslant 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_0]} \left\{ \|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}\Lambda\|_0^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}} \right\} \geqslant \frac{\eta r_0}{8} \text{ for all } \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda_0). \tag{10}$$

Again recall that $r_0 < \frac{1}{k}$, so

$$\rho\big(\Lambda_0, [0,T_0]\big) \geqslant \frac{\eta r_0}{8}.$$

By Corollary 4.1 and in view of (A) and (B), for all $T > T_0$,

$$m\left(\{t \in [0,T] : d_1(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}\Lambda_0) < l\delta\}\right) \leqslant C_k \left(\frac{8l\delta}{\eta r_0}\right)^{\alpha_k} T = T\frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\{t \in [0,T] : u_t x \notin X_\delta\}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon, \text{ for all } T > T_0.$$

In this case we are done.

Otherwise, (10) fails for every $T_0 \geqslant 0$. By Lemma 4.1, the set

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda_0) : \|\Lambda\|_0^{\frac{1}{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}} < \frac{\eta r_0}{8} \right\}$$

is finite. Therefore, as (10) fails for all $T_0 \geqslant 0$, there exists a $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}\Lambda\|_0 < \left(\frac{\eta r_0}{8}\right)^{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. By Proposition 4.4, it follows that $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}\Lambda\|_0 = \|\Lambda\|_0 < \left(\frac{\eta r_0}{8}\right)^{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}$. Thus the space $W := \mathbb{R}\text{-span}(\Lambda)$ is invariant under Ad_{u_t}, Λ is a lattice in W, and $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}\Lambda\|_0$ is a constant less than $\left(\frac{\eta r_0}{8}\right)^{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}$ for all $t > 0$.

We want to prove that there exists an abelian subgroup L such that L is u_t-invariant and $L \cap F$ is a lattice of L with small covolume. Note that if N is abelian, by Lemma 3.4, the subspace W constructed above is an abelian subalgebra and we can take $L = \exp(W)$. But in

general, we need more analysis.

Recall $W \subseteq \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H})$. As W is Ad_{u_t}-invariant, $\exp(\Lambda) \subseteq u_t \tilde{H} u_{-t} \cap \tilde{H}$. Hence $u_t \tilde{H} u_{-t} \cap \tilde{H}$ contains a nontrivial non-elliptic element for all $t > 0$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.2, for all $t > 0$ $u_t H u_{-t} = H$ and $\{u_t\} \subset H_U$, where H_U is the unipotent radical of H which is conjugate to N. Thus Ad_{u_t} acts trivially on $[\mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H}), \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H})]$.

Define

$$S = \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda : \exists\ t > 0 \text{ such that } \|u_t \lambda\| < \frac{\eta r_0}{2} \right\}.$$

Fix $\lambda = v + c$ in S, where $c \in [\mathrm{Lie}(H_U), \mathrm{Lie}(H_U)]$ and $v \in \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{H})$ is in the orthocomplement to $[\mathrm{Lie}(H_U), \mathrm{Lie}(H_U)]$. As $\tilde{H}$ is 2-step and $u_t \in H_U$,

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}(\lambda) = v + t[v, u] + c,$$

where $u_t = \exp(tu)$ and $u \in \mathrm{Lie}(H_U)$. By definition of S, there exists $t > 0$ such that $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \lambda\| < \frac{\eta r_0}{2}$. Thus by Lemma 3.4, $[v, u_t] \in [\mathrm{Lie}(H_U), \mathrm{Lie}(H_U)]$, v is orthogonal to $[v, u_t] + c$, and

$$\|v\| < \frac{\eta r_0}{2}. \tag{11}$$

Assume the Lie algebra $V := \mathbb{R}\text{-span}\{[S, S]\} \neq \{0\}$. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in S$. For $i = 1, 2$ there exists $c_i \in [\mathrm{Lie}(H_U), \mathrm{Lie}(H_U)]$ and v_i in the orthogonal compliment to $[\mathrm{Lie}(H_U), \mathrm{Lie}(H_U)]$ such that $\gamma_i = v_i + c_i$. By (11), $\|v_1\|, \|v_2\| < \frac{\eta r_0}{2}$, and by the fact $\tilde{H}$ is 2-step, $[\gamma_1, \gamma_2] = [v_1, v_2]$. Thus

$$\|[\gamma_1, \gamma_2]\| < (\frac{\eta r_0}{2})^2.$$

Let $\Delta = \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{S\}$. Then $[\Delta, \Delta]$ is generated by elements whose norm is bounded by $(\frac{\eta r_0}{2})^2$. By Lemma 3.5, $[\Delta, \Delta]$ is discrete. Thus the covolume of $[\Delta, \Delta]$ in V is at most $(\frac{\eta r_0}{2})^{2\dim(V)}$. As V is contained in the commutator, V is Ad_{u_t} invariant, and

$$\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Delta\|_0 = C < \left(\frac{\eta r_0}{2}\right)^{2\dim(V)} \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

By Lemma 3.5, $\Lambda_0 \subseteq \frac{1}{2}\exp^{-1}(\tilde{F})$. Let $L = \exp(V)$. From above, L is abelian, $L \cap F$ is a lattice in L, L is u_t-invariant, and the covolume of $u_t(L \cap \tilde{F})u_{-t}$ in $u_t L u_{-t} = L$ with respect to the measure induced by our right invariant inner-product is a constant which is at most $(\frac{\eta r_0}{l})^{2\dim(L)} = (\frac{1}{l c_{\epsilon/2}} \delta)^{2\dim(L)}$.

Now assume that $V = \{0\}$. As shown previously, $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Lambda\|_0 < (\frac{\eta r_0}{8})^{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}$. Thus, by Lemma 4.2, for every $t > 0$, $d_1(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Lambda) < \frac{\eta r_0}{2}$. As before, let $\Delta = \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{S\}$. By the definition of S, for every $t > 0$,

$$d_1(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Delta) < \frac{\eta r_0}{2}. \tag{12}$$

We claim that (12) forces $\rho(\Delta, [0, T]) \leqslant C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0$ for all $T > 0$. For the sake of a contradiction, assume that there exists a $T_0 > 0$ such that $\rho(\Delta, [0, T_0]) > C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0$. Then $\frac{\eta r_0}{2} < C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0$ and by Corollary 4.1,

$$m\left(\left\{t \in [0, T_0] : d_1\left(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Delta\right) < \frac{\eta r_0}{2}\right\}\right) \leqslant T_0 C_k \left(\frac{\frac{\eta r_0}{2}}{C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0}\right)^{\alpha_k} = \frac{T_0}{2^{\alpha_k}} < T_0. \tag{13}$$

Now (12) and (13) contradict each other. Hence for all $T > 0$, we have $\rho(\Delta, [0, T]) \leqslant C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0$. By the definition of ρ and Lemma 4.1, repeat the argument above, there exists $\Delta_1 \subset \Delta$ such that $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Delta_1\|_0 \leqslant C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0$ for all $t > 0$. By Proposition 4.4, if we take $W_1 := \mathbb{R}\text{-span}\{\Delta_1\}$, then W_1 is Ad_{u_t} invariant, Δ_1 is a lattice in W_1, and $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t} \Delta_1\|_0$ is a constant less than $(C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \eta r_0)^{\mathrm{rank}(\Delta_1)}$.

As $V = \{0\}$, W_1 is a Lie algebra. In this case, let $L = \exp(W_1)$. Thus $L \cap \tilde{F}$ is a lattice in L, L is u_t-invariant, and the covolume of $u_t(L \cap \tilde{F})u_{-t}$ in $u_t L u_{-t}$ with respect to the measure induced by our right invariant inner-product is a constant which is at most $\left(2C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}} \frac{\eta r_0}{l}\right)^{\dim(L)} = \left(\frac{2C_k^{\frac{1}{\alpha_k}}}{lc_{\epsilon/2}}\delta\right)^{\dim(L)}$. Thus the theorem holds with $\beta_\epsilon = \max\left\{\frac{2^{k^2+4}C_k^{2k^2}}{\epsilon^{k^2}}, \frac{2^{k^2+3}C_k^{2k^2}}{\epsilon^{2k^2}}\right\}$. □

5 Non-Divergence: Products of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 groups

The case when G is the product of semisimple groups of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 is more delicate. We will again partition $[0, T]$ into intervals where the intersection $G_{u_t x} \cap B_{r_0}$ is trivial and intervals where the intersection is nontrivial. However, we will not be able, as in the case of Theorem 1.1, to find a dominant nilpotent subgroup on each interval with nontrivial intersection. Indeed, there exist intervals with nontrivial intersection, along which no dominant nilpotent subgroup is possible.

To handle this problem, we break each interval down further and find dominant nilpotent subgroups on each sub interval. Yet this alone will not complete the proof, as we must also guarantee that on each sub interval the covolume of the lattice in the Lie algebra of our dominant subgroup and all of its sub lattices obtain a fixed positive lower bound. To ensure a time with large covolume we extend each subinterval so that the enlarged interval includes such a time. This extension allows us to apply the theorem of Kleinbock and Margulis, but in doing so our intervals are no longer disjoint. Fortunately, by our restriction on the discrete subgroup, the potentially bad times occurring on the intersection of two extended intervals can be measured by studying a discrete group in a connected nilpotent subgroup having projections on less coordinates. The theorem then follows from induction on the number of projections on nontrivial coordinates.

5.1 Algebraic properties of products of $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 semisimple Lie Groups

In this section, let $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$ where each G_i is a rank-1 semisimple Lie group, Γ be a discrete group, and $X = G/\Gamma$. Denote the projection of G onto the i-th factor by π_i. We further assume Γ satisfies the following property:

$(*)$ for any element $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{e\}$, $\pi_i(\gamma)$ is not elliptic for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

For each G_i, let $\mathfrak{g}_i$ be the Lie algebra of G_i. Analogously to section 2, define the groups A_i, M_i and N_i in G_i and let $\|\cdot\|_i$ be the norm derived from the Killing form on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_i$. Let $\|\cdot\| = \sup_i \|\cdot\|_i$ be the norm on $\mathfrak{g} := \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. Again, for sufficiently small r, $B_r \subseteq G$ will denote the exponential of the open ball of radius r centered at the origin in $\mathfrak{g}$. Fix $r_0 < \frac{1}{k}$ where k is the dimension of G, such that B_{r_0} is a Zassenhaus neighborhood for G and $\exp^{-1}$ is well defined on B_{r_0}. As before, for $0 < \eta \leqslant r_0$, let $X_\eta = \{x \in X : G_x \cap B_\eta = \{e\}\}$, and for $\eta > r_0$, let $X_\eta = X$.

The following three lemmas generalize the corresponding lemmas from section 3 to the product case.

Lemma 5.1. *For any discrete subgroup Γ satisfying $(*)$, $\Gamma \cap B_{r_0}$ is contained in a conjugate of $H_1 \times \ldots \times H_n$ where each $H_i \in \{\{e\}, M_i A_i, M_i N_i\}$.*

Proof. By the definition of the Zassenhaus neighborhood, the subgroup Δ generated by $\Gamma \cap B_{r_0}$ is nilpotent. For $i = 1, \ldots, n$. $\pi_i(\Delta)$ is nilpotent, and since Γ satisfies $(*)$, $\pi_i(\Delta)$ contains no nontrivial elliptic elements. If $\pi_i(\Delta) = \{e\}$, then set $H_i = \{e\}$. Otherwise, by Lemma 3.1,

$\pi_i(\Delta)$ is contained in either a conjugate of M_iA_i or M_iN_i.

□

Lemma 5.2. *For any discrete subgroup Λ in $F_1 \times ... \times F_n$ where each $F_i \in \{\{e\}, M_iA_i, M_iN_i\}$, there exists a subgroup Λ_0 of finite index such that Λ_0 is contained in a connected nilpotent subgroup of $F_1 \times ... \times F_n$. Moreover, the index $[\Lambda, \Lambda_0]$ is bounded by a number l_M depending only on $M = M_1 \times \cdots \times M_n$.*

Proof. It is straightforward to deduce this from Lemma 3.3.

□

Lemma 5.3. *Any connected nilpotent subgroup of $H_1 \times ... \times H_n$, where each $H_i \in \{\{e\}, M_iA_i, M_iN_i\}$, is 2-step nilpotent.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.4 via the projections π_i to H_i.

□

5.2 Intervals of maximal intersection

Fix a one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ in G.

Definition 5.1. *Let $x \in X$, $s > 0$, and $0 < r \leqslant r_0$. Let H be a subgroup of G. If $G_{u_s x} \cap u_s H u_{-s} \cap B_r \neq \{e\}$, let*

$$a = \sup_{t<s} \{t : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H u_{-t} \cap B_r = \{e\}\},$$

and

$$b = \inf_{t>s} \{t : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H u_{-t} \cap B_r = \{e\}\}.$$

Otherwise, let $a = b = s$. We define $I(H, s, r, x) := (a, b)$. For $T > 0$ define

$$I_T(H, s, r, x) := [0, T] \cap I(H, s, r, x).$$

When the choice of x is clear, we will abbreviate $I(H, s, r, x)$ and $I_T(H, s, r, x))$ by $I(H, s, r)$ and $I_T(H, s, r)$ respectfully.

Note: If $t \in I_T(H, s, r, x)$, then

$$I_T(H, t, r, x) = I_T(H, s, r, x). \tag{14}$$

Definition 5.2. *Let H be a subgroup of G. We say that H is a $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup if $\pi_j(H)$ is conjugate to $\{e\}$, M_jA_j, or M_jN_j for $j = 1, \ldots n$. Let $\mathcal{KN}$ denote the collection of all $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroups. Further, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let*

$$\mathcal{KN}_i = \big\{H \in \mathcal{KN} : \#\big\{j : \pi_j(H) \neq \{e\}\big\} = i\big\}$$

The following proposition provides the main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.4 and follows from a result of Kleinbock [K10]. (See Theorem 4.1)

Proposition 5.1. *Let $0 < r \leqslant r_0$. Let $H \in \mathcal{KN}$, and $x \in X$. Suppose there exists $T_x > 0$ such that $G_{u_{T_x} x} \cap B_r = \{e\}$. Then for any $T > T_x$ and $s \in [0, T]$,*

$$m\Big(\big\{t \in I_T(H, s, r) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H u_{-t} \cap B_{\overline{c}_\epsilon r} \neq \{e\}\big\}\Big) \leqslant \epsilon \cdot m(I_T(H, s, r)),$$

where $\overline{c}_\epsilon = \left(\frac{\epsilon}{C_k}\right)^{k^2} \frac{1}{8 l_M}$ where k is the dimension of G, $C_k = k^3 2^k (k^2+1)^{\frac{1}{k^2}}$, and l_M is the constant as in Lemma 5.2.

Proof. If $G_{u_s x} \cap u_s H u_{-s} \cap B_r = \{e\}$, then by definition, $I_T(H,s,r) = \emptyset$ and the proposition holds for the $\overline{c}_\epsilon$.

Now suppose that $G_{u_s x} \cap u_s H u_{-s} \cap B_r \neq \{e\}$. Let $F = G_x \cap H$. Then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H u_{-t} = u_t F u_{-t} \tag{15}$$

By Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.2, and Lemma 5.3 there exists a subgroup $\tilde{F} \subseteq F$ such that $\tilde{F}$ is contained in a connected 2-step nilpotent subgroup $\tilde{H} \subseteq H$ and $[F : \tilde{F}] \leqslant l_M$. Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}(\exp^{-1} \tilde{F})$. By the assumptions that $G_{u_{T_H} x} \cap B_r = \{e\}$ and $T > T_H$, there exists $a \in \overline{I_T(H,s,r)}$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}_{u_a} \tilde{F} \cap B_r = \{0\}$. So by Lemma 3.5, $d_1(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_a}(\Lambda)) > \frac{r}{2}$. Then by Corollary 4.1 with $\rho > r/8$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& m\Big(\big\{t \in I_T(H,s,r))|u_t F u_{-t} \cap B_{\overline{c}_\epsilon r} \neq \{e\}\big\}\Big) \\
\leqslant\ & m\Big(\big\{t \in I_T(H,s,r))|u_t \tilde{F} u_{-t} \cap B_{l_M \overline{c}_\epsilon r} \neq \{e\}\big\}\Big) \\
\leqslant\ & m\Big(\big\{t \in I_T(H,s,r))|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}(\Lambda) \cap \mathfrak{b}_{l_M \overline{c}_\epsilon r} \neq \{e\}\big\}\Big) \\
\leqslant\ & m\Big(\big\{t \in I_T(H,s,r))|d_1(\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}(\Lambda)) < l_M \overline{c}_\epsilon r\big\}\Big) \\
\leqslant\ & C_k \left(\frac{l_M \overline{c}_\epsilon r}{\rho}\right)^{\alpha_k} m(I_T(H,s,r))) \\
\leqslant\ & \epsilon \cdot m(I_T(H,s,r))).
\end{aligned}$$

The proposition then follows from (15).

□

Definition 5.3. *Let $p \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\}$ and $T > 0$. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{KN}_p \times [0,T]$. For $0 < r < r_0$, let*

$$I_T(\mathcal{F}, r) := \bigcup_{(H,t) \in \mathcal{F}} I_T(H,t,r).$$

Note that if $p = 0$, then $I_T(\mathcal{F}, r) = \emptyset$.

Definition 5.4. *Let H be a subgroup of G. Let $F_i = \{e\}$ if $\pi_i(H) = \{e\}$, otherwise let $F_i = G_i$. Define* $\mathrm{Hull}(H) = F_1 \times \cdots \times F_n$.

The following proposition is a crucial ingredient in our proof of the product case.

Proposition 5.2. *Fix $x \in X$. Let $H^1, H^2 \in \mathcal{KN}_p$ be such that* $\mathrm{Hull}(H^1) = \mathrm{Hull}(H^2)$ *and $H^1 \neq H^2$. Let $T > 0$, $0 < r \leqslant r_0$, and $s_1, s_2 \in [0,T]$. Then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{KN}_{p-1} \times [0,T]$ such that*

$$I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r) \subseteq I_T(\mathcal{F}, r).$$

Proof. We may assume that $I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r) \neq \emptyset$, since otherwise the statement holds trivially. For $i = 1, 2$, by the fact that $H^i \in \mathcal{KN}_p$, we may assume without loss of generality, that

$$(g^{(i)})^{-1} H^i g^{(i)} = L_1^i \times \cdots \times L_p^i \times \{e\} \times \cdots \times \{e\}$$

for some $g^{(i)} = g_1^{(i)} \times \cdots \times g_n^{(i)}$ in G and $L_j^i \in \{M_j A_j, M_j N_j\}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Since H^1 and H^2 are distinct we may assume that $g_p^{(1)} L_p^1 (g_p^{(1)})^{-1} \neq g_p^{(2)} L_p^2 (g_p^{(2)})^{-1}$.

Fix $t \in I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r)$. For $i = 1, 2$, there exists nontrivial $h^{(i)} \in H^i$ such that $(g^{(i)})^{-1} h^{(i)} g^{(i)} = l_1^{(i)} \times \cdots \times l_p^{(i)} \times e \times \cdots \times e$ with $l_j^{(i)} \in L_j^i$, for $j = 1, \ldots, p$ and

$$u_t h^{(i)} u_{-t} \in G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H^i u_{-t} \cap B_r.$$

Since B_r is a Zassenhaus neighborhood, there exists a connected nilpotent group $H(t)$ such that

$$G_{u_t x} \cap B_r \subseteq H(t).$$

By Lemma 5.1, $H(t)$ is contained in $H_1(t) \times \cdots \times H_n(t)$ where each $H_i(t)$ is conjugate to $\{e\}$, $M_j A_j$, or $M_j N_j$.

Thus conjugates of $l_p^{(1)}, l_p^{(2)}$ lie in $H_p(t)$. If $l_p^{(i)}$ is nontrivial, since $h^{(i)} \in \Lambda$, $\pi_p(h^{(i)}) \in g_p^{(i)} L_p^i (g_p^{(i)})^{-1} \cap H_p(t)$ is non-elliptical, and hence by Corollary 3.2, $g_p^{(i)} L_p^i (g_p^{(i)})^{-1} = H_p(t)$. By the fact that $g_p^{(1)} L_p^1 (g_p^{(1)})^{-1} \neq g_p^{(2)} L_p^2 (g_p^{(2)})^{-1}$, it follows that $l_p^{(1)}$ and $l_p^{(2)}$ cannot both be nontrivial. For $i = 1, 2$ let

$$F^i = g^{(i)}\big(L_1^i \times \cdots \times L_{p-1}^i \times \{e\} \times \cdots \times \{e\}\big)(g^{(i)})^{-1} \in \mathcal{KN}_{p-1}.$$

Without loss of generality assume that $l_p^{(1)}$ is trivial. Define $F(t) = F^1$. By construction $h^{(1)} \in F(t)$ and

$$u_t h^{(1)} u_{-t} \in G_{u_t x} \cap u_t F(t) u_{-t} \cap B_r, \text{ and } t \in I_T(F(t), t, r).$$

Thus, for each $t \in I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r)$, $F(t)$ is either F^1 or F^2. Note that since $g^{(1)}$ and $g^{(2)}$ are fixed, there are only finitely many choices of $F(t)$, and by Lemma 3.6, each possible $F(t)$ can only generate finitely many intervals of non-intersection. Thus there exist times $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ such that

$$I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} I_T(F(t_i), t_i, r).$$

□

Corollary 5.1. *Fix $x \in X$. Let $H^0, H^1, \ldots H^q \in \mathcal{KN}_p$ be such that* $\mathrm{Hull}(H^0) = \mathrm{Hull}(H^1) = \cdots = \mathrm{Hull}(H^q)$ *and H^0 is distinct from H^i for all $i > 0$. Let $T > 0$, $0 < r < r_0$, and $s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_q \in [0, T]$ be such that*

$$I_T(H^0, s_0, r) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} I_T(H^i, s_i, r).$$

Then there exist a finite set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{KN}_{p-1} \times [0, T]$ such that

$$I_T(H^0, s_0, r) \subseteq I_T(\mathcal{F}, r).$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.2, for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$, there exists a finite set $\mathcal{F}^j \subseteq \mathcal{KN}_{p-1} \times [0, T]$ such that

$$I_T(H^0, s_0, r) \cap I_T(H^j, s_j, r) \subseteq I_T(\mathcal{F}^j, r).$$

Then

$$I_T(H^0, s_0, r) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{q} I_T(H^0, s_0, r) \cap I_T(H^j, s_j, r) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{q} I_T(\mathcal{F}^j, r).$$

□

Corollary 5.2. *Fix $x \in X$. Let $H^1, H^2 \in \mathcal{KN}_1$ be such that* $\mathrm{Hull}(H^1) = \mathrm{Hull}(H^2)$. *Let $s_1, s_2 > 0$ and $0 < r \leqslant \delta$. Then one of the following holds*

1. $I_T(H^1, s_1, r) = I_T(H^2, s_2, r)$
2. $I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r) = \emptyset$

Proof. If $H^1 = H^2$ and $t \in I(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I(H^2, s_2, r) \neq \emptyset$, then by (14),

$$I_T(H^1, s_1, r) = I_T(H^1, t, r) = I_T(H^2, s_2, r).$$

If $H^1 \neq H^2$, by Proposition 5.2, $I_T(H^1, s_1, r) \cap I_T(H^2, s_2, r) \subseteq I_T(\mathcal{F}, r) = \emptyset$, where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{KN}_0 \times [0, T] = \{e\} \times [0, T]$.

□

Proposition 5.3. *Fix $x \in X$, $T > 0$, and $0 < r \leqslant r_0$. Let $J = \{t \in [0, T] : G_{u_t x} \cap B_r \neq \{e\}\}$. There exist $H^1, H^2, \ldots, H^m \in \mathcal{KN}_n$ and pairwise disjoint intervals $I^1, I^2, \ldots, I^m$ such that for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, H^j is (r, u_t, x)-dominant on I^j and $\overline{J} = \cup_{j=1}^M I^j$.*

Proof. Fix $t \in \overline{J}$. By Lemma 5.1 and the fact that B_r is a Zassenhaus neighborhood there exists a group $H(t)$ which is conjugate to $H_1 \times H_2 \times ... \times H_n$ where each H_i is either $M_i A_i$ or $M_i N_i$ and

$$G_{u_t x} \cap B_r \subseteq u_t H(t) u_{-t}.$$

By continuity there exists an open interval $I(t)$ containing t such that $H(t)$ is (r, u_t, x)-dominant on $I(t)$. By compactness of $\overline{J}$, a finite number of such intervals will cover $\overline{J}$. We may then shrink the intervals if needed to insure that $\overline{J} = \cup_{j=1}^m I^j$ and that the intervals are disjoint. Our intervals may or may not contain their end points.

□

For the sake of clarity, we first present the proof of the first half of Theorem 1.4 in the case when G is the product of 2 semisimple $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 groups. Most of the ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.4 appear in this case and notation is simpler.

5.3 Quantitative non-divergence in the case $G = G_1 \times G_2$.

Proof. Let $\delta < r_0$, fix $x \in X_\delta$, fix $T > 0$ and fix a one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of G. We show the conclusion holds with $c_\epsilon = \bar{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}$, where $\bar{c}_\epsilon$ is as in Proposition 5.1. Since $x \in X_\delta$, it follows that $G_{u_0 x} \cap B_r = \{e\}$. Thus by Proposition 5.1, for any $0 < r \leqslant \delta$, $H \in \mathcal{KN}$, and $s \in [0, T]$,

$$m\Big(\big\{t \in I_T(H, s, r) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H u_{-t} \cap B_{\bar{c}_{\epsilon/4} r} \neq \{e\}\big\}\Big) \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{4} \cdot m(I_T(H, s, r)). \tag{16}$$

Equation (16) is the main tool used in this proof and follows from the work of Kleinbock and Margulis [K10] [KM98].

Let $J = \big\{t \in [0, T] : G_{u_t x} \cap B_{\bar{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\big\}$. By Proposition 5.3 There exists a finite set $\{H^j\} \subseteq \mathcal{KN}_2$ and a corresponding collection of intervals $\{I_j\}$ such that H^j is $(\bar{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta, u_t, x)$-dominant on I_j and $\overline{J} = \cup_j I_j$. By construction of the intervals I_j, for each j there exists $t_j \in I_j$ such that

$$G_{u_{t_j} x} \cap u_{t_j} H^j u_{-t_j} \cap B_{\bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}.$$

Suppose $H^i = H^j$, $i \neq j$, and $I_T\left(H^i, t_i, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) \cap I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) \neq \emptyset$, then by equation (14),

$$I_T\left(H^i, t_i, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) = I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right).$$

In this case

$$m(I_i \cup I_j) \leqslant m(\{t \in I_T(H^i, t_i, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H^i u_{-t} \cap B_{\bar{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\}). \tag{17}$$

Let

$$S = \big\{i : \text{ for all } j < i \text{ either } H_i \neq H_j \text{ or } I_T\left(H^i, t_i, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) \neq I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \bar{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right)\big\}.$$

S discards duplicate maximal intervals of $\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta$-intersection arising from the same $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup, so by equation (17)

$$m(J) = m\left(\bigcup_i \left\{t \in I_i : G_{u_t x} \cap B_{\overline{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) \tag{18}$$

$$\leqslant m\left(\bigcup_{i\in S} \left\{t \in I_T\left(H^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H^i u_{-t} \cap B_{\overline{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\right\}\right). \tag{19}$$

As S is finite there exists $\tilde{S} \subset S$ such that

$$\bigcup_{j\in S} I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) = \bigcup_{j\in\tilde{S}} I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right),$$

and for each $t \in [0,T]$, t belongs to at most 2 intervals $I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right)$ with $j \in \tilde{S}$ (some $t \in [0,T]$ may not be covered). Thus

$$\sum_{j\in\tilde{S}} m\left(I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right)\right) \leqslant 2T. \tag{20}$$

Let $j \in S \setminus \tilde{S}$. For each $i \in \tilde{S}$, either H^i and H^j are distinct or $I_T\left(H^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right)$ and $I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right)$ are disjoint. So if $\tilde{S}_j := \{i \in \tilde{S} : H^i \neq H^j\}$, then

$$I_T\left(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right) \subseteq \bigcup_{i\in\tilde{S}_j} I_T\left(H^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right). \tag{C}$$

Therefore, by Corollary 5.1, there exists a finite set $\{F^i\} \in \mathcal{KN}_1$ and $\{s_i\} \in [0,T]$ such that

$$\bigcup_{j\in S\setminus\tilde{S}} I_T(H^j, t_j, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta) \subseteq \bigcup_i I_T(F^i, s_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta). \tag{D}$$

Define

$$S' = \left\{i : I_T(F^i, s_i, \delta) \neq I_T(F^j, s_j, \delta) \text{ for all } j < i \text{ with } \operatorname{Hull}(F_i) = \operatorname{Hull}(F_j)\right\}$$

Analogously to equation (19),

$$m\left(\bigcup_{i\in S\setminus\tilde{S}} I_T(H^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta)\right) \leqslant m\left(\bigcup_i I_T\left(F^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta\right)\right) \tag{21}$$

$$\leqslant \sum_{i\in S'} m\left(\left\{t \in I_T(F^i, s_i, \delta) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t F^i u_{-t} \cap B_{\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) \tag{22}$$

By Corollary 5.2, for $i, j \in S'$ such that $i \neq j$ and $\operatorname{Hull}(F^i) = \operatorname{Hull}(F^j)$, we have that $I_T(F^i, s_i, \delta)$ and $I_T(F^j, s_j, \delta)$ are disjoint. Hence,

$$\sum_{i\in S'} m\left(I_T(F^i, s_i, \delta)\right) \leqslant 2T. \tag{23}$$

For $r = \delta$ and $r = \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta$, by equation (16),

$$m\left(\left\{t \in I_T(H^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t H^i u_{-t} \cap B_{\overline{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{4} m\big(I_T(H^i, t_i, \overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta)\big), \tag{24}$$

and

$$m\left(\left\{t \in I_T(F^i, s_i, \delta) : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t F^i u_{-t} \cap B_{\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta} \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{4} m\big(I_T(F^i, s_i, \delta)\big). \tag{25}$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
m(J) &\leqslant m\left(\bigcup_{i\in S}\left\{t\in I_T(H^i,t_i,\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta) : G_{u_tx}\cap u_tH^iu_{-t}\cap B_{\overline{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta}\neq\{e\}\right\}\right) && \text{(Equation (19))}\\
&\leqslant \sum_{i\in\tilde{S}} m\left(\left\{t\in I_T(H^i,t_i,\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta) : G_{u_tx}\cap u_tH^iu_{-t}\cap B_{\overline{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta}\neq\{e\}\right\}\right)\\
&\quad + m\left(\bigcup_{i\in S\setminus\tilde{S}}\left\{t\in I_T(H^i,t_i,\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta) : G_{u_tx}\cap u_tH^iu_{-t}\cap B_{\overline{c}^2_{\epsilon/4}\delta}\neq\{e\}\right\}\right)\\
&\leqslant \sum_{i\in\tilde{S}}\frac{\epsilon}{4}m\left(I_T(H^i,t_i,\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta)\right) + m\left(\bigcup_{i\in S\setminus\tilde{S}} I_T(H^i,t_i,\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta)\right) && \text{(Equation (24))}\\
&\leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}T + \sum_{i\in S'} m\left(\left\{t\in I_T(F^i,s_i,\delta) : G_{u_tx}\cap u_tF^iu_{-t}\cap B_{\overline{c}_{\epsilon/4}\delta}\neq\{e\}\right\}\right) && \text{(Equations (20) and (22))}\\
&\leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}T + \sum_{i\in S'}\frac{\epsilon}{4}m\left(I_T(F^i,s_i,\delta)\right) && \text{(Equation (25))}\\
&\leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}T + \frac{\epsilon}{2}T = \epsilon T. && \text{(Equation (23))}
\end{aligned}
$$

□

5.4 Quantitative non-divergence in the case $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$

Proof. Let $0 < \delta < r_0$. Fix $x \in X_\delta$, fix $T > 0$ and fix a one-parameter unipotent subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of G. We need the following proposition.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\overline{c}_\epsilon$ be as in Proposition 5.1, and for $p = 0,\dots,n$, let $\delta_p = \overline{c}_\epsilon^p\delta$. Let*

$$J = \left\{t\in[0,T] : G_{u_tx}\cap B_{\overline{c}_\epsilon^n\delta}\neq\{e\}\right\}.$$

For every $1\leqslant p\leqslant n$ there exist finite sets $\mathcal{T}^p,\mathcal{F}^p,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p\subset\mathcal{KN}_p\times[0,T]$ such that

1) $J\subseteq I_T(\mathcal{T}^n,\delta_n)$
2) $\mathcal{F}^p,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p\subseteq\mathcal{T}^p$, *and* $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^1=\emptyset$.
3) $I_T(\mathcal{F}^p,\delta_p)\cup I_T(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p,\delta_p) = I_T(\mathcal{T}^p,\delta_p)$
4) *For every $t\in[0,T]$, t belongs to at most $2\binom{n}{p}$ elements of $\{I_T(H,t,\delta_{p-1})\}_{(H,t)\in\mathcal{F}^p}$*
5) *If additionally $p\neq 1$, $m\left(I_T(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p,\delta_{p-1})\right)\leqslant m\left(I_T(\mathcal{T}^{p-1},\delta_{p-1})\right)$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Let us construct $\mathcal{T}^n$. Let $H_1,\dots,H_l\in\mathcal{KN}_n$ and intervals $I_1,\dots,I_l$ contained in $[0,T]$ satisfy Proposition 5.3 with $r=\delta_n$. For each $j\in\{1,\dots,l\}$, fix $t_j\in I_j$. By the construction,

$$J\subseteq\bigcup_{i=1}^{l} I_T\left(H_i,t_i,\delta_n\right). \tag{26}$$

Then 1) holds for $\mathcal{T}^n=\{(H_j,t_j)\}_{j=1}^l$.

In the following, we shall use backward induction to construct $\mathcal{F}^p,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p$ and $\mathcal{T}^p$ for $p=n,n-1,\dots,2$. Let $2<p\leqslant n$ and assume that (1) $\mathcal{T}^m$ has been constructed for $m=p,\dots,n$, and (2) $\mathcal{F}^m$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^m$ have been constructed for $m=p+1,\dots,n$ if $p<n$. Partition the collection $\mathcal{T}^p$ into $\binom{n}{p}$ sub-collections such that if $\mathrm{Hull}(H_i)=\mathrm{Hull}(H_j)$, then (H_i,t_i) and (H_j,t_j) belong to the same sub-collection. Arbitrarily index these sub-collections as $\mathcal{T}^p_1,\mathcal{T}^p_2,\dots,\mathcal{T}^p_{\binom{n}{p}}$, and

pick any one of these, say, $\mathcal{T}_j^p$. Then because of the finiteness of $\mathcal{T}_j^p$, there exists a further sub-collection $\mathcal{F}_j^p \subseteq \mathcal{T}_j^p$ such that for every $t \in [0,T]$, t belongs to at most two elements of $\{I_T(F,s,\delta_{p-1})\}_{(F,s)\in\mathcal{F}_j^p}$, and

$$\bigcup_{(F,s)\in\mathcal{F}_j^p} I_T(F,s,\delta_{p-1}) = \bigcup_{(F,s)\in\mathcal{T}_j^p} I_T(F,s,\delta_{p-1}). \tag{27}$$

Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^p := \left\{(H,t) \in \mathcal{T}_j^p \setminus \mathcal{F}_j^p : \ \forall\ (F,s) \in \mathcal{F}_j^p, \text{ if } F = H, \text{ then } I_T(F,s,\delta_p) \neq I_T(H,t,\delta_p)\right\}.$$

Then for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^p$, repeating the argument as in the proof of $G_1 \times G_2$ case (see equations (C) and (D)), by Corollary 5.1 there exists a finite set $\mathcal{S}_j^{p-1} \in \mathcal{KN}_{p-1} \times [0,T]$ such that

$$I_T\left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^p, \delta_{p-1}\right) \subseteq I_T\left(\mathcal{S}_j^{p-1}, \delta_{p-1}\right). \tag{28}$$

Now let $\mathcal{T}^{p-1} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\binom{n}{p}} \mathcal{S}_j^{p-1}$, $\mathcal{F}^p = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\binom{n}{p}} \mathcal{F}_j^p$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\binom{n}{p}} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^p$. By the definition of $\mathcal{F}^p$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p$, 2) holds. By definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p$, 3) holds. By the definition of $\mathcal{F}_j^p$, 4) holds. Finally, by definition of $\mathcal{T}^{p-1}$ and (28), we have that 5) holds. Thus by induction we have constructed $\mathcal{T}^p$ for $p = 1,\dots,n$ and $\mathcal{F}^p$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p$ for $p = 2,\dots,n$. Let $\mathcal{F}^1 = \mathcal{T}^1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^1 = \emptyset$. By definition, 2), 3), 5) follow easily and 4) holds due to Corollary 5.2.

□

Now we are in the position to prove the quantitative non-divergence in the case when $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$. Recall that $x \in X_{\delta_0}$. By Proposition 5.1, for $j = 1,\dots,n$, $H \in \mathcal{KN}$, and $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_j)\right) &\leqslant m\left(\left\{t \in I_T(H,t,\delta_{j-1}) : G_{u_t x} \cap B_{\delta_j} \neq \{e\}\right\}\right) &(29)\\ &\leqslant \epsilon m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_{j-1})\right) &(30)\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.4 #3 and #5, for $p = 2,\dots,n$

$$\begin{aligned} m\left(I_T(\mathcal{T}^p,\delta_p)\right) &\leqslant m\left(I_T(\mathcal{F}^p,\delta_p)\right) + m\left(I_T(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p,\delta_p)\right) &(31)\\ &\leqslant \sum_{(H,t)\in\mathcal{F}^p} m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_p)\right) + m\left(I_T(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^p,\delta_{p-1})\right) &(32)\\ &\leqslant \sum_{(H,t)\in\mathcal{F}^p} m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_p)\right) + m\left(I_T(\mathcal{T}^{p-1},\delta_{p-1})\right) &(33)\end{aligned}$$

In the following final step, we shall use (33) inductively for $p = n, n-1,\dots,2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} m(J) &\leqslant m\left(I_T(\mathcal{T}^n,\delta_n)\right) && \text{(Prop. 5.4 \#1.)}\\ &\leqslant \sum_{(H,t)\in\mathcal{F}^n} m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_n)\right) + m\left(I_T(\mathcal{T}^{n-1},\delta_{n-1})\right) && \text{(Equation (33))}\\ &\leqslant \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{(H,t)\in\mathcal{F}^p} m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_p)\right) && \text{(Induction (33))}\\ &\leqslant \epsilon \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{(H,t)\in\mathcal{F}^p} m\left(I_T(H,t,\delta_{p-1})\right) && \text{(Equation (30))}\\ &\leqslant \epsilon \sum_{p=1}^{n} 2T\binom{n}{p} = 2(2^n-1)\epsilon T. && \text{(Prop. 5.4 \# 4.)}\end{aligned}$$

Thus the analogue of Theorem 1.3 for the product case holds for $c_\epsilon = \left(\overline{c}_{\epsilon/(2(2^n-1))}\right)^n$. This proves the first part of Theorem 1.4. □

5.5 Uniform non-divergence in the case $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Fix $r_0 > 0$ such that B_{r_0} is a Zassenhaus neighborhood and let $\eta \in (0, 1]$. By the proof of Theorem 1.4 there exists $c_{\epsilon/2} > 0$ such that if $x = g\Gamma \in X_{\eta r_0}$, then for any unipotent one parameter subgroup $\{u_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of G,

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\left\{t \in [0, T] : u_t x \notin X_{c_{\epsilon/2}\eta r_0}\right\}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon, \text{ for all } T \geqslant 0.$$

Furthermore, if x and t_0 are such that $u_{t_0} x \in X_{\eta r_0}$, then for $T > t_0(2\epsilon^{-1} - 1)$

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\left\{t \in [0, T] : u_t x \notin X_{c_{\epsilon/2}\eta r_0}\right\}\right) < \epsilon.$$

We will prove the theorem for $\delta_\epsilon = c_{\epsilon/2} r_0$. Let $\delta = \eta\delta_\epsilon$ and let $x \in X$. We may assume that $u_t x \notin X_{\eta r_0}$ for all $t > 0$, otherwise, by above, we are finished.

Suppose there exists a $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup H such that $I(H, t, \eta r_0) = [0, \infty)$. By arguing similarly to the proof the proof of Theorem 1.3, there exists a constant $\beta_\epsilon = \max\left\{\frac{16C_k^{2k^2}}{l_M c_{\epsilon/2}}, \left(\frac{8C_k^{k^2}}{l c_{\epsilon/2}}\right)^2\right\}$, where k is the dimension of G, l_M is the constant found in Lemma 5.2, and $C_k = 2^k k^3 (k^2+1)^{\frac{1}{k^2}}$, such that there exists a proper abelian subgroup $L \subseteq H \subseteq G$, $\Delta := g\Gamma g^{-1} \cap L$ is a lattice in L, u_t normalizes L, and the covolume of $u_t \Delta u_{-t}$ in $u_t L u_{-t}$ is a fixed constant bounded by $(\beta_\epsilon \delta)^{\dim(L)}$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. In fact, the same proof works verbatim, with the exception of the construction of Λ. In the current case, we argue as in equations (12) and (13) to find Λ such that $W := \mathbb{R}\text{-span}(\Lambda)$ is invariant under Ad_{u_t}, Λ is a lattice in W, and $\|\mathrm{Ad}_{u_t}\Lambda\|_0$ is a constant less than $(2C_k^{k^2}\eta r_0)^{\mathrm{rank}(\Lambda)}$ for all $t > 0$. Then the theorem holds in this case.

Thus we may assume that for any $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup H and any $t > 0$ we have $I(H, t, \eta r_0) \neq [0, \infty)$. If we can prove that there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that for any $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup H and $t \in [0, T_0]$

$$I(H, t, \eta r_0) \cap [0, T_0] \neq [0, T_0], \tag{34}$$

then by Proposition 5.1, the equation (30) holds for $T > T_0$. As Proposition 5.4 holds independent of the choice of x, the arguments of section 5.4 hold, and we have

$$\frac{1}{T} m\left(\left\{t \in [0, T] : u_t x \notin X_{c_{\epsilon/2}\eta r_0}\right\}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon, \text{ for all } T \geqslant T_0.$$

Thus for this x the trajectory is non-divergent, and we are done.

The rest is to prove equation (34). First of all, we need several definitions. For a $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup F, let

$$t_F := \min\left\{t \geqslant 0 : G_{u_t x} \cap u_t F u_{-t} \cap B_{\eta r_0} = \{e\}\right\}.$$

Since $I(F, t, \eta r_0) \neq [0, \infty)$, it follows that $t_F < \infty$. Moreover, for a time $t \geqslant 0$, we define H_t to be the minimal $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup (that is, the $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup with the least coordinates) such that $G_{u_t x} \cap B_{\eta r_0} \subseteq H_t$. For two $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroups F_1 and F_2, let $\pi_{F_2^\perp}(F_1)$ denote the projection of F_1 onto the coordinates on which F_2 is trivial. For a $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup F, define L_F to be the smallest $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup containing both F and $\pi_{F^\perp}(H_{t_F})$.

Now we inductively construct collections $\{\mathcal{H}_i\}$ of $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroups as follows: for the time $t = 0$, let

$$\mathcal{H}_0 := \{F \in \mathcal{KN} : F \subseteq H_0\},$$

and for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, let

$$\mathcal{H}_i := \{H \in \mathcal{KN} : \exists\ F \in \mathcal{H}_{i-1} \text{ and } H \subseteq L_F\}.$$

Let

$$T_0 = \max\{t_F : F \in \cup_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{H}_i\}.$$

We will show equation (34) for this T_0. Let F be a $\mathcal{KN}$-subgroup. Define $F_0 = F \cap H_0$ and for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, let $F_i = L_{F_{i-1}} \cap F$. If $F_0 = \{e\}$, then $T_F = 0$ and equation (34) holds. If for some $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we have that $F_i = F_{i-1}$, then by construction

$$G_{u_{t_{F_{i-1}}}} \cap B_{r_0} \cap u_{t_{F_{i-1}}} F u_{-t_{F_{i-1}}} = \{e\}.$$

Since $F_{i-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{i-1}$, it follows that $t_{F_{i-1}} < T_0$ and F satisfies equation (34). If for every $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, $F_i \neq F_{i-1}$, then $F = F_{n-1}$, $F \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1}$, and again F satisfies equation (34). □

References

[Dan79] S.G. Dani. On invariant measures, minimal sets and a lemma of Margulis. *Inventiones Math*, 51(03):239–260, 1979. 1

[Dan84] S.G. Dani. On orbits of unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 4(01):25–34, 1984. 1, 9

[Dan86] S.G. Dani. On orbits of unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces, ii. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 6(02):167–182, 1986. 1, 2, 9, 12

[DM93] S.G. Dani and G. A. Margulis. Limit distributions of orbits of unipotent flows and values of quadratic forms. *Advances in Soviet Mathematicsl*, 16:91–137, 1993. 9

[DS84] S.G. Dani and J Smillie. Uniform distribution of horocycle orbits for fuchsian groups. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 51:185–194, 1984.

[K10] D.Y. Kleinbock. *Quantitative nondivergence and its Diophantine applications*, 2010. 2, 9, 10, 15, 18

[KM98] D.Y. Kleinbock and G. A. Margulis. Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximations on manifolds. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 148:339–360, 1998. 2, 9, 10, 18

[M75] G. A. Margulis. *On the action of unipotent groups in the space of lattices*, Halsted, New York, 1975. 1, 9

[Rag72] M.S. Raghunathan. *Discrete Subgroups of Lie Groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York, New York, 1972. 1, 3

[Ra90] M. Ratner. On measure rigidity of unipotent subgroups of semisimple groups. *Acta Math*, 165:229–309, 1990. 1

[Sel60] A. Selberg. On discontinuous groups in higher dimensional symmetric spaces. *Contributions to Function Theory*, pages 147–164, 1960. 2